

Re: Flora Lewis column in Washington Post, 17 December 71, Flora Lewis implies that in the debate on the Defense Appropriations Bill, the senators stressed the fact that little was known about what the Agency was doing with its funds in SEAsia. Actually both Ellender and Fulbright and others stated it was "no secret" that "it had been published."

She also says that Sen. Ellender replied to Sen. Fulbright, when questioned about being told before the CIA set the secret army in Laos, "It was not - I did not know any thing about it." He did say that but immediately before that in answer to the same question Sen. Ellender responded, "Probably so." She completely omits this and makes Ellender appear to be totally uninformed when that was not the case.

She also includes Sen. Cranston's question to Sen. Ellender about whether he inquired about press stories indicating CIA funds being used in Laos. She provides us with Sen. Ellender's reply which was, as she said: "I have not inquired" and then later he said, "Probably not," to Cranston's comment about nobody in Congress knowing. Ellender did say this but it came after the debate above and must be taken in that context, which the Lewis article fails to do.

In summary, Lewis portrays Sen. Ellender as being uninformed about CIA activities from the Agency but even more uninformed about press items. The actual debate shows clearly that neither implication is accurate.

CRC, 3/4/2003

LOS ANGELES TIMES
23 DEC 1971

Who's Watching the CIA?

BY FLORA LEWIS

WASHINGTON—So far as I've found in a lot of traveling, the United States is the only country in the world which lists its intelligence agency in the telephone book, and enables anyone to call up and speak to the director's office.

But an extraordinary exchange on the floor of the Senate recently made clear how little else the people who put up the money for intelligence know about how it is spent. The debate took place on the day the military appropriations bill was finally passed so it attracted little attention, but it was revealing.

It was provoked by Sen. Stuart Symington (D-Mo.), who offered an amendment providing that not more than \$4 billion in the defense budget could go for the intelligence services, including the CIA, the National Security Agency and the intelligence branches of the various armed services. Symington's point was not only to set a limit, but to set a precedent.

★

Congress does appropriate all the money that goes to intelligence, but it doesn't know how much, or even when and how. That's because it is hidden in the defense budget, with the result that Congress doesn't really know just what it is appropriating any military money for because it never knows which items have been selected for padding to hide extra funds for intelligence.

Evidently, Symington believes that the actual amount spent is a little over \$4 billion, instead of the \$6 billion reported in the press, because he wasn't trying to cut intelligence funds except for CIA payments to Thai soldiers in Laos. He is one of the nine senators entitled to go to meetings of the appropriations subcommittee on the CIA, supposedly the confidential watchdog over the agency.

What he wanted to do was to establish that Congress does have some rights to monitor the intelligence empire which it created by law, and he was driven to the attempt because of exasperation at President Nixon's recent intelligence reorganization. It was announced to the public as an upgrading of CIA Director Richard Helms and a better method to avoid waste and establish political control.

Symington, and many other well-informed CIA watchers in Washing-

ton, are convinced that Helms has been kicked upstairs. The result, they believe, will be an increase in military influence over intelligence—which has been recognized as a danger throughout the history of intelligence because it tends to become self-serving, the doctor diagnosing himself according to the therapy he likes.

Responsible political control over the intelligence community's actions, as distinct from its factual and analytical reports, is necessary and desirable. But despite the public impression, in the last few years the CIA has been the most honest source of information for Congress on sensitive issues such as Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia.

But, as the Senate debate showed, that isn't saying very much. Sen. Allen Ellender (D-La.), who heads the CIA subcommittee, pointed out that 20 years ago only two senators and two congressmen were allowed to know what the CIA was spending, and now there are five on each side of the Capitol.

He implied that they also knew what the CIA was spending its money for. Sen. J. William Fulbright (D-Ark.) had the wit to ask if that meant Ellender knew, before the CIA set up its secret army in Laos, that this was the purpose of the appropriation. Ellender said, "It was not, I did not know anything about it . . . it never dawned on me to ask about it."

★

Sen. Alan Cranston (D-Calif.) had the humor to point out that there has been a lot in the press about the CIA Laotian army in the past couple of years, and asked whether Ellender has now inquired about it. Ellender said, "I have not inquired." Cranston pointed out that since nobody else in Congress has Ellender's right to check the CIA, that meant nobody in Congress knows. Ellender replied, "Probably not."

Symington's amendment was defeated. But at least the record is now clear. A recent Newsweek article quoted a former CIA official as saying, "There is no federal agency of our government whose activities receive closer scrutiny and 'control' than the CIA."

"The reverse of that statement is true," said Symington, "and it is shameful for the American people to be so misled. The record proves him right."

LIMA, OHIO

NEWS DEC 15 1971

E - 40,873

S - 45,674

CIA Secrets Target Of Senate Inquiries

By GEORGE KENTERA
WASHINGTON (NANA) — Both Senate and House are showing a growing restiveness over being kept in the dark about this country's vast intelligence apparatus.

This restiveness is particularly strong in the Senate at present, but it also exists in the House — and it has been present almost since 1949, when the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) was first granted power by Congress to operate without congressional review.

The mounting frustration on Capitol Hill is hardly likely to produce any legislation requiring disclosure by the Nixon administration of intelligence funding or activities.

But it is almost certain to result next year in discreet efforts, primarily by Congressional committees and subcommittees involved, to lift at least partially the curtain that now hides an intelligence effort said to cost up to \$6 billion a year.

Sen. John C. Stennis, D-Miss., powerful chairman of the Armed Forces Committee, has already felt compelled to promise a thorough committee study and, "if necessary," an investigation into intelligence operations.

In making that promise to the Senate, Stennis specifically referred to President Nixon's reorganization early this month of the U.S. intelligence system — a reorganization that some senators fear removes the system even farther from any accountability to Congress.

Two other signs point to some congressional action next year:

— Sen. Stuart Symington, the Missouri Democrat who has long protested the lack of information Congress gets about intelligence matters, reportedly is ready to press a demand that the Senate be given accounting in private session.

— And Rep. Lucien N. Nedzi, Detroit Democrat and chairman of a special House subcommittee on intelligence, is quietly laying the groundwork for what is likely to be public hearings about the many-sided intelligence apparatus.

Members of Congress like Symington and Nedzi are not seeking to know all, or even a good deal, about the nation's intelligence setup. But they believe Congress as a rule ought to know something, perhaps about the intelligence budget, and they are dissatisfied with the present system, under which only a handful of senators and representatives knows any of the facts.

On the night of Nov. 23, the Senate held an extraordinary debate on an amendment by Symington to the \$70.8 billion defense appropriations bill. The amendment would have set a limit of \$4 billion for intelligence spending — by the CIA, National Security Agency, Defense Intelligence Agency and for intelligence work performed by or for the Army, Navy and Air Force.

Fifty-six senators voted against and defeated the amendment — but 31 senators voted for it. And one of those 31 votes was from Montana's Democratic Sen. Mike Mansfield, the majority leader, who praised Symington and said, perhaps significantly:

"He has raised an issue which is just now in its infancy, but which in time I am confident will grow to enormous proportions. It is time, in my judgment, that we take a long, hard look at our intelligence community, its function and objectives."

Nedzi thinks so, too. In his preparatory work, he and his subcommittee aides have all the CIA, the Defense Depart-

ment and the State Department; and also "eight hours of continuous discussions" at the national security agency.

Still to come are the FBI, the Atomic Energy Commission and, finally, the intelligence agencies of the armed services that reportedly spend the lion's share of the intelligence budget.

"I haven't come to any conclusion... Yet on the whole question of how far one should go in making public activities of this kind," Nedzi says. "What I think I'd like to do is get people from the agencies to present unclassified versions of their positions and provide a forum for critics and students of the problems."

An opponent of the war in Vietnam, Nedzi thinks his appointment in July as chairman of the intelligence subcommittee by Rep. F. Edward Hebert of Louisiana, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, may have "tempered the strong passions" some frustrated house members have about intelligence procedures.

Still, more than a dozen bills have been introduced in Congress this year aimed at making intelligence agencies, particularly the CIA, accountable to Congress. That is a rate slightly higher than average since 1949; in the two decades since then, almost 200 such bills have been introduced — and none has passed.

Whatever review power Congress has over intelligence matters resides in four congressional subcommittees.

On the House side, one is Nedzi's subcommittee, created in July. The other is the intelligence operations subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee. Its members are an official secret, but there is good reason to believe they are the ranking three Democrats and two Republicans on the full committee's defense subcommittee. George Mahons of Texas.

On the Senate side there are also two subcommittees. One is the central intelligence subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee which includes Stennis, Symington, Democrat Henry M. Jackson of Washington and Republicans Peter H. Dominick of Colorado and Barry Goldwater of Arizona. This subcommittee reviews CIA programs, but not financing.

The other is the intelligence operations subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee. Its members are Chairman Allen J. Ellender of Louisiana, Stennis, Democrat John L. McClellan of Arkansas and Republicans Milton R. Young of North Dakota and Mrs. Margaret Chase Smith of Maine.

It seems worth noting that Symington is a part of these elite groups and yet is a leading protester against the setup they represent.

One reason may be Ellender's explanation on Nov. 23 about the way five senators (from the Appropriations Committee) decide what funds the intelligence agencies need.

"This method of appropriating funds for these intelligence activities has been in effect for at least 20 years that I know of..." He said. "We five who sit on this committee hear the testimony of those applying for funds. The funds are justified to us."

"We ask many questions. None of this information is in writing, nor is it recorded, but it is simply given to us, and we weigh it and then recommend appropriations as is seen fitting... I would hesitate to suggest that more senators and more members of the House be involved in this sensitive work."

At another point, Symington and his supporters referred to newspaper disclosures two years ago that the CIA was financing much of the war in Laos.

Intell Act Gen

Approved For Release 2005/04/28 : CIA-RDP73B00296R000200220009-7

NEW YORK, N.Y.
POST

EVENING - 623,245
WEEKEND - 354,797

NOV 16 1971 See China Freeing 2 CIA Men

HONG KONG (CDN) — Two American intelligence agents who have served 19 years in a Chinese Communist prison for espionage will be released by Christmas as a good-will gesture to set the stage for President Nixon's visit to Peking after the first of the year, according to well-informed sources. The two are John Thomas Downey of New Britain, Conn., and Richard George Fecteau of Lynn, Mass., both CIA agents who were captured when their unmarked plane was shot down over Manchuria Nov. 19, 1952. Downey's release could be imminent.

His mother, Mrs. Mary Downey, 74, and brother, William, 39, a New York lawyer, arrived in Hong Kong Sunday after visiting John the last two weeks in Peking.

Mrs. Downey said her son informed them Saturday that his case was being "reviewed" in accordance with the Chinese "policy of leniency."

"I was delighted to find Jack in excellent health and fine spirits," she said.

Life Sentence

"We have no information as to when or if will be released," William said. "But he assumed the prison officials wouldn't have given him this information [that his case was under review] if they weren't planning to release him."

"They said an important factor is a prisoner's behavior while in prison and they consider his good."

Mrs. Downey said she also had been allowed to visit Fecteau, being held in the same prison, and that Fecteau also had been in excellent health and fine spirits.

Downey was sentenced to life imprisonment. Fecteau has virtually completed his 2-year sentence.

Sources believed that Peking would free both men simultaneously for maximum propaganda effect.

That the two men would be set free has been more or less taken for granted since the announcement of Nixon's visit to Peking signaled a thaw in Sino-American relations.

Another favorable omen was that Mrs. Downey's current visit to Peking had been the first Communist authorities had allowed in seven years.

China analysts pointed out that Peking had nothing to lose and a great deal to gain—in terms of good will by letting the two go.

Approved For Release 2005/04/28 : CIA-RDP73B00296R000200220009-7

U.S. Prisoner in China May Be Freed--Mother

HONG KONG (UPI)—
An American serving a
life term in a Chinese pri-
son as a spy may be re-
leased soon, his mother
said Monday.

Mrs. Mary Downey, 70, a former school teacher from New Britain, Conn., made the statement after a series of visits with her son, John, 42, in his Peking prison.

Downey and another American, Richard C. Fecteau, 43, of Lynn, Mass., both civilian employees of the Army, disappeared on a "regularly scheduled flight from Korea to Japan on Nov. 29, 1952," according to the U.S. State Department.

They were captured by the Chinese and sentenced as spies by a military tribunal in 1954. Downey was sentenced to life in prison and Fecteau was sentenced to 20 years.

Mrs. Downey, who first visited her son a dozen years ago, was accompa-

nied on the recent trip by another son, William, and his wife.

During their two-week
stay, she said, they visit-
ed Downey eight times
and were allowed to stay
two hours each time.

"At the end of our visit Jack told us that he had been informed by the prison authorities his case was being reviewed to determine what their policy of leniency might be—he might be released rather than serve out his sentence.

"The prison officials told Jack that an important factor in deciding to apply leniency was the prisoner's behavior while in prison and that they consider that his behavior had been good," she said.

"I am hoping with all my heart that my prayers for Jack's release will soon be answered," she said.